

A PSEUDOEXPONENTIAL-LIKE STRUCTURE ON THE ALGEBRAIC NUMBERS

VINCENZO MANTOVA

ABSTRACT. Pseudoexponential fields are exponential fields similar to complex exponentiation satisfying the Schanuel Property, which is the abstract statement of Schanuel's Conjecture, and an adapted form of existential closure.

Here we show that if we remove the Schanuel Property and just care about existential closure, it is possible to create several existentially closed exponential functions on the algebraic numbers that still have similarities with complex exponentiation. The main difficulties are related to the arithmetic of algebraic numbers, and can be overcome with known results about specialisations of multiplicatively independent functions on algebraic varieties.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pseudoexponentiation is a structure introduced by Zilber in [7] in order to find out how $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$ should look like to be well-behaved, at least for the criteria of a model theorist. The unsurmountable problem of $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$ is that it defines the ring of integers, hence Peano's arithmetic, defying the model-theoretic tools widely used in the last decades.

However, Zilber proved that if $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$ satisfies certain algebraic conjectures, Peano's arithmetic is essentially the only problem. He showed that there is a sentence Ψ , in the infinitary language $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}(Q)$, which is *uncountably categorical*, and that described an exponential field which is reasonably similar to $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$. Its models have been called pseudoexponential fields, perfect exponential fields, or Zilber fields. The two algebraic conjectures that are contained as statements in Ψ are the Schanuel Property and the Strong Exponential-algebraic Closure.

The Schanuel Property is nothing else than a rephrasing of Schanuel's Conjecture for an abstract exponential function E :

$$\text{tr.deg.}(x_1, \dots, x_n, E(x_1), \dots, E(x_n)) \geq \text{lin.d.}_{\mathbb{Q}}(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

It is well known that the Schanuel Property is not enough to characterise well an exponential function, as formally shown by Hyttinen in [1]: there are $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$ surjective exponential functions on $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying the Schanuel Property and whose kernel is a cyclic group.

Here we show a related result, in a quite different vein, about the Exponential-algebraic Closure. We show that if we drop all the assumptions about transcendence in Zilber's axiom Ψ , then we can construct several models where the Schanuel Property is falsified in the most drastic way: everything is algebraic!

Theorem 1.1. *There is a function $E : \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ such that*

- (1) $E(x + y) = E(x) \cdot E(y)$ for all $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
- (2) $\ker(E) = \omega\mathbb{Z}$ for some $\omega \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$;
- (3) E is surjective;
- (4) for any absolutely free variety V over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and any proper subvariety $V' \subset V$, there is an $\bar{x} \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $(\bar{x}, E(\bar{x})) \in V \setminus V'$.

If we consider the class of structures K_E , where K is a field and E is an exponential function with cyclic kernel, then $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E$ is existentially closed: whenever $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E \subset K_{E'}$, and some finite system of polynomial exponential equations and inequations with parameters in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ has a solution in $K_{E'}$, then it already has a solution in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given using an explicit inductive construction very similar to the one of [4] and it is described, along with the list of Zilber's axioms, in Section 2. The construction itself is well-defined, and it works as desired, thanks to some arithmetic properties of number fields about specialisations that were analysed in [6] and in other papers. In Section 3 we use these results to prove that the our construction yields the desired result.

The author would like to thank his supervisor Prof. Alessandro Berarducci, who proposed to study pseudoexponential fields, Jonathan Kirby for having proposed the problem solved in this paper, and Profs. David Masser and Umberto Zannier for the suggestions about the number-theoretic part of this paper that greatly simplified the discussion.

2. THE CONSTRUCTION

2.1. Zilber's original axiomatisation. For the sake of clarity, we briefly recall the axiomatisation of actual pseudoexponential fields. A field K_E is a pseudoexponential field (or Zilber field or perfect exponential field) if it satisfies the following list of axioms. We will explain later the meaning of some of the terms used. We refer the reader to [7, 5].

2.1.1. *Trivial properties of $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$.*

- (ACF₀) K is an algebraic closed field of characteristic 0.
- (E) E is a homomorphism $E : (K, +) \rightarrow (K^\times, \cdot)$.
- (LOG) E is surjective (every element has a logarithm).
- (STD) the kernel is a cyclic group, i.e., $\ker E = \omega\mathbb{Z}$ for some $\omega \in K^\times$.

2.1.2. *Axioms conjecturally true on $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$.*

- (SP) *Schanuel Property*: for every finite tuple $\bar{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in K$ such that $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$,

$$\text{tr.deg.}_{\mathbb{Q}}(z_1, \dots, z_n, E(z_1), \dots, E(z_n)) \geq n.$$

- (SEC) *Strong Exponential-algebraic Closure*: for every irreducible “absolutely free rotund” variety $V \subset K^n \times (K^*)^n$, and every finite tuple $\bar{c} \in K^{<\omega}$ such that V is defined over $\bar{c}$, there is $\bar{z} \in K^n$ such that $(\bar{z}, E(\bar{z})) \in V$ is a generic point over $\bar{c}$.

2.1.3. *A non-trivial property of $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$ [7, Lemma 5.12].*

- (CCP) *Countable Closure Property*: for every absolutely free rotund variety $V \subset \mathbb{G}^n$ over K of “depth 0”, and every finite tuple $\bar{c} \in K^{<\omega}$ such that V is defined over $\bar{c}$, the set of the generic points of V over $\bar{c}$ of the form $(\bar{z}, E(\bar{z}))$ is at most countable.

We will explain the meaning of “absolutely free” but skip “rotund” and “depth 0”. The latter term are strictly related to the presence of the Schanuel Property, and we won't need them in this discussion. First we need to define “free”.

Definition 2.1. A variety $V \subset K^n \times (K^*)^n$ is *additively free* over $L \subset K$ if there is no nontrivial additive combination of the coordinate functions of the factor K^n whose restriction on V is constant and contained in $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(L)$. In other words, the coordinate functions restricted to V are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from L .

We can state a similar property for the multiplicative side $(K^*)^n$.

Definition 2.2. A variety $V \subset K^n \times (K^*)^n$ is *multiplicatively free* over $M \subset K^*$ if there is no nontrivial multiplicative combination of the coordinate functions of the factor $(K^*)^n$ whose restriction on V is constant and contained in the divisible hull of the group generated by M . In other words, the coordinate functions restricted to V are multiplicatively independent from M .

Absolute freeness is when $L = K$ and $M = K^*$.

Definition 2.3. A variety $V \subset K^n \times (K^*)^n$ is *absolutely additively free* if it is additively free over K .

V is *absolutely multiplicatively free* if it is multiplicatively free over K^* .

V is *absolutely free* if it is both absolutely additively free and absolutely multiplicatively free.

2.2. Axioms for $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E$. Our goal is to build an exponential field $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E$ as similar as possible to pseudoexponentiation, without the axiom (SP). Clearly, we want, and actually can, keep the trivial properties of $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$ as they are. The axiom (CCP) doesn't even need to be mentioned, as $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is countable, even if reformulated as “the exponential-algebraic closure of a finite set is countable” which would be more sensible in this case. The only axiom that requires some change is (SEC).

The axiom (SEC) is a special form of existential closure adapted to the presence of (SP) and to Hrushovski's amalgamation: if a system of equations and inequations in K_E has a solution in some “strong kernel preserving extension”, then it has already a solution in K_E . The “strong” part is due to the presence of (SP), so in our case we just drop it, and we ask that if a system of equations has a solution in some kernel preserving extension of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E$, then it has a solution in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_E$.

It can be verified that it is equivalent to the following:

- (EC) For any absolutely free variety $V \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^n \times (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*)^n$ and any proper subvariety $V' \subset V$, there is an $\overline{x} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $(\overline{x}, E(\overline{x})) \in V \setminus V'$.

The two differences with (SEC) are that we do not require V to be rotund, which is essentially linked to the use of strong extensions and the presence of (SP), and that we explicitly force the points $(\overline{x}, E(\overline{x}))$ to be Zariski-dense by taking out V' , while in (SEC) this is automatic by genericity.

This structure would be obviously existentially closed also if we use just strong kernel preserving extensions. We could also go forth and mimic the strong part of (SEC), by using its reformulation in [3]: for any finite $\overline{a} \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, we can require the existence of an $\overline{x}$ such that $(\overline{x}, E(\overline{x})) \in V \setminus V'$ with $\overline{x}$ $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from $\overline{a}$. It will be apparent from the proof that this possibility can be achieved with very slight modifications, but since this extra property loses meaning without (SP), we won't try to obtain it in our model.

2.3. The construction. The construction is quite similar to other construction techniques [2, 4]. We define the function E by induction using a back-and-forth procedure.

Let us fix $\omega \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ and let us define our base function as $E_{-1}(\frac{p}{q}\omega) = \zeta_q^p$, for $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\{\zeta_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a coherent system of roots of unity. This yields $\ker(E_{-1}) = \omega\mathbb{Z}$.

Now let $\{\alpha_n\}$ be an enumeration of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ and $\{(V_n, V'_n)\}$ an enumeration of all the pairs of irreducible absolutely free varieties V_n with proper closed subvarieties $V'_n \subset V_n$. At each step $n < \omega$ we proceed as follows:

- (1) If α_n is not in the domain of E_{n-1} , we choose some $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^* \setminus \text{img}(E_{n-1})$ and we define

$$E_{n-1}^1(\alpha + \frac{p}{q}\alpha_n) := E_{n-1}(\alpha) \cdot \beta^{p/q},$$

for all $\alpha \in \text{dom}(E_{n-1})$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$. If α_n is in the domain, we just define $E_{n-1}^1 := E_{n-1}$.

- (2) If α_n is not in the image, we choose some $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \text{dom}(E_{n-1}^1)$ and we define

$$E_{n-1}^2(\alpha + \frac{p}{q}\beta) := E_{n-1}^2(\alpha) \cdot \alpha_n^{p/q},$$

for all $\alpha \in \text{dom}(E_{n-1}^1)$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$. If α_n is already in the image, we just define $E_{n-1}^2 := E_{n-1}^1$.

- (3) If $V_n \subset (\mathbb{G}_a \times \mathbb{G}_m)^k$, we take a point $(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta_k) \in V_n \setminus V'_n$ such that

- (a) $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ is $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from $\text{dom}(E_{n-1}^2)$;
- (b) $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k$ is multiplicatively independent from $\text{img}(E_{n-1}^2)$;

and we define $E_n(\alpha + \frac{p_1}{q_1}\alpha_1 + \dots + \frac{p_k}{q_k}\alpha_k) := E_{n-1}^2(\alpha) \cdot \beta_1^{p_1/q_1} \dots \beta_k^{p_k/q_k}$

for all $\alpha \in \text{dom}(E_{n-1}^2)$ and $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The limit function $E := \bigcup_{n < \omega} E_n$ is the function we sought in Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First of all, we claim that all the above three steps can be actually done. Clearly, (1) and (2) are possible, as $\text{dom}(E_n^i)$ and $\text{img}(E_n^i)$ are always finite-rank groups, hence we can always find a suitable β .

To prove that (3) is possible, we need to study a little the arithmetic of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$; it will be proved in Proposition 3.1.

Then we need to show that each E_n is well defined, and in particular E , but this is true, as $\text{dom}(E_n)$ is always a $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space, and the new elements on which we define the function are always $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from the previous domain. Moreover, E is defined everywhere.

Similarly, $\ker(E) = \ker(E_n) = \ker(E_{-1}) = \omega\mathbb{Z}$, since every time we define the new function, the new image is multiplicatively independent from the previous image. Moreover, E is surjective.

Finally, it is clear that for each V, V' there is point $(\overline{x}, E(\overline{x})) \in V \setminus V'$. $\square$

3. POINTS WITH INDEPENDENT COORDINATES

In order to finish the proof, we need to verify the following fact.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $V \subset (\mathbb{G}_a \times \mathbb{G}_m)^n$ be an irreducible absolutely free variety over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, and let $L < \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $M < \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ be two finite-rank subgroups. The set of points $(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \in V$ such that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ is $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from L , and such that $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are multiplicatively independent from M , is Zariski dense in V .*

It is known that if we take a variety V and some functions on it that are multiplicatively independent (the functions are allowed to be constant), then for “most” points $P \in V(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ the values of the functions at P are still multiplicatively independent [6].

Similarly, it is also not difficult to show that at many points the specialisations of $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent functions are still $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent (again, functions are allowed to be constant). In order to put together the two statements, we first intersect our variety with hyperplanes, using Bertini’s theorem, to reduce to the case when V is a curve. We first take care of the additive part.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a quasi-projective absolutely irreducible curve defined over a field K , and let $k = \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \cap K$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be some $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent functions in $K(\mathcal{C})$. Let $z \in K(\mathcal{C})$ be a non constant function.*

There is a number $d > 0$, not dependent on z , such that for any $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $[k(\alpha) : k] > d$, the specialisations of $x_1, \dots, x_n$ at any point $P \in z^{-1}(\alpha)$ are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is smooth. We may also assume that the first functions $x_1, \dots, x_k$ are constant, while the remaining $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n$ are not. Let e be the maximum of $[K(\mathcal{C}) : K(x_i)]$ as x_i ranges among the last $n - k$ non constant functions.

Clearly, the equation

$$m_1 x_1 + \dots + m_k x_k + m_{k+1} x_{k+1} + \dots + m_n x_n = 0,$$

with the m_i 's not all zero, can be solved only in at most $(n - k)e$ points algebraic over K , since the function on the left is either constant, hence non-zero by assumption, or it has degree at most $(n - k)e$. This implies that for any $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, if $[K(\alpha) : K] = [k(\alpha) : k] > (n - k)e$, then any $P \in z^{-1}(\alpha)$ is such that $x_1(P), \dots, x_n(P)$ are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent. Note that it may happen for finitely many α 's that there are no points of $\mathcal{C}$ in $z^{-1}(\alpha)$, since the curve is just quasi-projective.

Indeed, let L be a normal extension of K which defines P . Clearly, $L \cap \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \supset k(\alpha)$ is a normal extension of k by the assumption $k = K \cap \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is absolutely irreducible, we can extend the Galois action of $\text{Gal}(L/K)$ to $\text{Gal}(L(\mathcal{C})/K(\mathcal{C}))$. If there are $m_1, \dots, m_n$ such that the above equation is satisfied, then by conjugation we obtain several other $\sigma(P)$ satisfying the same equation. Since $z(\sigma(P)) = \sigma(\alpha)$, and $[k(\alpha) : k] > (n - k)e$, we find more than $(n - k)e$ distinct conjugates of P all satisfying the above equation, a contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an absolutely irreducible curve defined over k . Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be some $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent functions in $k(\mathcal{C})$.*

There is a number $d' > 0$ such that for any $P \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{k})$ with $[k(P) : k] > d'$, the specialisations of $x_1, \dots, x_n$ at P are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent.

Proof. Let us take a non-constant function $z \in k(\mathcal{C})$, whose degree is at most some number e .

Let d be the number obtained by Proposition 3.2, and let $d' \geq d \cdot e$. We take d' large enough such that $z(P)$ is defined for each point with $[k(P) : k] > d'$.

Now, if P is a point such that $[k(P) : k] > d' := d \cdot e$, then $z(P)$ is defined, finite and $[k(z(P)) : k] > d$. By the previous proposition, the specialisations of $x_1, \dots, x_n$ at P are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent. $\square$

An analogous but different statement holds for the multiplicative case for varieties of dimension greater than 1.

Proposition 3.4. *Let V be an absolutely irreducible quasi-projective variety defined over k with $\dim(V) > 1$. Let $w_1, \dots, w_n$ be some functions in $k(V)$ that are multiplicatively independent modulo constants.*

There is a non-constant function $z \in k(V)$ such that the restrictions of $w_1, \dots, w_n$ at $V \cap \{z = \alpha\}$ are multiplicatively independent modulo constants for almost all $\alpha \in \overline{k}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that V is smooth and projective.

Since $w_1, \dots, w_n$ are multiplicatively independent modulo constants, it means that the Weil divisors of $w_1, \dots, w_n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent. Up to taking a multiplicative combination of the w_i 's, we may assume that there are $W_1, \dots, W_n$ distinct prime divisors such that w_i has a pole in W_i , but has no zeroes and poles among the remaining W_j 's; in other words, the matrix $(o_{W_i}(w_j))_{i,j}$ is diagonal.

Up to enlarging k , we may assume that these prime divisors have degree 1 and are all defined over k . It is clear that in the space of all hyperplanes H that intersect

V properly, the ones such that $H \cap W_i = H \cap W_j$, with $i \neq j$, form a proper Zariski closed subset. By Bertini's theorem, it is also true that the ones such that $H \cap V$ is not absolutely irreducible, and similarly the ones such that $H \cap W_i$ is not absolutely irreducible, form proper Zariski closed sets.

It is clear that we can find an hyperplane H represented by an equation $z = 0$ such that $\{z = \alpha\} \cap W_i$ and $\{z = \alpha\} \cap V$ are all smooth absolutely irreducible varieties for almost all $\alpha \in \overline{k}$. But then the restrictions of $w_1, \dots, w_n$ to $\{z = \alpha\} \cap V$ are such that $(o_{H \cap W_i}(w_j))_{i,j}$ is still a diagonal matrix, which implies that their divisors are still $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent, hence the restrictions are multiplicatively independent modulo constants. $\square$

Using the above statements, we can easily reduce to the case of curves, which we solve in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset (\mathbb{G}_a \times \mathbb{G}_m)^n$ be an irreducible curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $L < \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $M < \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ be two finite-rank subgroups. If $\mathcal{C}$ is absolutely multiplicatively free, and additively free over L , then the set of points $(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ is $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from L , and such that $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are multiplicatively independent from M , is Zariski dense in $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is absolutely irreducible. Let $w_1, \dots, w_n$ be the multiplicative coordinate functions of $\mathcal{C}$, and let $a_1, \dots, a_m$ be a finite set of divisible generators of M , and let H be a hypersurface not containing $\mathcal{C}$. Let k be a number field defining $\mathcal{C}$ and containing $a_1, \dots, a_m$.

Using the notation of [6], we define

- $\mathcal{C}(d, h)$ the set of all points of $\mathcal{C}$ of degree at most d and height at most h ;
- $\mathcal{E}(d, h)$ the set of all points of $\mathcal{C}$ of degree at most d and height at most h such that the specialisations of $w_1, \dots, w_n$ are multiplicatively dependent on M ;
- $\omega(S)$, for a finite set S , the minimum degree of an hypersurface containing all the points of S .

Applying the main result of [6, §5] to $\mathbb{G}_m(k(\mathcal{C}))$ and to the group generated by $w_1, \dots, w_n, a_1, \dots, a_m$, we find a function $c_1(d)$ and a number k such that $\omega(\mathcal{E}(d, h)) \leq c_1(d)h^k$, while we also find a c_2 such that $\omega(\mathcal{C}(d, h)) \geq \exp(c_2(d)h)$ when d is at least the degree of $\mathcal{C}$.¹

Now using Corollary 3.3 on $\mathcal{C}$ and L we obtain a number d_1 such that when $[k(P) : k] > d_1$ the additive coordinates of P are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from L . We may choose d_1 larger than the degree of $\mathcal{C}$ and of H . Now let d_2, h_1, h_2 be numbers such that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\mathcal{C}(d_2, h_2)) &\geq \exp(c_2(d_2)h_2) > \omega(\mathcal{C}(d_1, h_1)) + c_1(d_2)h_2^k \geq \\ &\geq \omega(\mathcal{C}(d_1, h_1)) + \omega(\mathcal{E}(d_2, h_2)); \end{aligned}$$

Then there must be a point P outside of H , of degree strictly greater than d_1 , such that the specialisations of $w_1, \dots, w_n$ at P are multiplicatively independent from $a_1, \dots, a_m$, hence from M . Since its degree is greater than d_1 , its additive coordinates are also $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from L , as desired. $\square$

It only remains to show that we can reduce to curves.

¹The statement of [6] is actually that $\omega(\mathcal{C}(d, h)) \geq \exp(ch)$ when $d = \deg(\mathcal{C})$. However, the proof only requires that there is a dominant map $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^m$ of degree d with $m = \dim \mathcal{C}$. Such maps exist for example for any multiple of $\deg(\mathcal{C})$, as we can compose π with dominant self maps of $\mathbb{P}^m$ which exist for any positive degree.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We prove the theorem by induction on $m = \dim(V)$. Our inductive hypothesis is that V is absolutely irreducible, absolutely multiplicatively free, and that it is additively free over L . The base case $m = 1$ is covered by Proposition 3.5. Let k be a number field defining V .

Let us suppose that $m > 1$, and that we have proven the theorem for all the varieties of dimension $m - 1$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be the additive coordinate functions of V , and $w_1, \dots, w_n$ be its multiplicative coordinate functions. Moreover, let $\{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$ -basis of the vector space generated by L . By Proposition 3.4, there is a non-constant function z such that for almost all $\alpha \in \bar{k}$ we have

- (1) $V_\alpha := V \cap \{z = \alpha\}$ is absolutely irreducible;
- (2) $\dim(V_\alpha) = m - 1$;
- (3) the functions $\{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ restricted to V_α are multiplicatively independent modulo constants.

Now take any transcendence base of $k(V)$ of the form $X \cup \{z\}$. Then V can be seen also as a quasi-projective absolutely irreducible curve over $k(X)$, and z is a nonconstant function on it.

By applying Proposition 3.2 to V seen as a curve over $K := k(X)$, as soon as $[k(\alpha) : k]$ is sufficiently large, the functions $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent when restricted to V_α . Therefore V_α satisfies the same properties of V , and by inductive hypothesis, it contains a Zariski-dense set of points whose additive coordinates are $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent from L , and whose multiplicative coordinates are multiplicatively independent from M .

Now, if $W \subset V$ is a proper closed subset, then for almost all α 's $W \cap V_\alpha$ is a proper closed subset of V_α . This implies that we can find such points outside of W , and in turn, they are Zariski-dense in V . $\square$

Remark 3.6. The above proof relies on the results exposed in [6]. These results depend on the Northcott Property of number fields. Using other techniques of Diophantine geometry it is possible to obtain a similar result for other finitely generated fields without the same quantitative statements, but still strong enough to obtain again Proposition 3.5. This implies that this construction works also on all algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0, and in particular of any fixed transcendence degree.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tapani Hyttinen. Random logarithm and homogeneity. In Andreas Blass and Yi Zhang, editors, *Logic and Its Applications*, pages 137–166. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2005.
- [2] Jonathan Kirby. Finitely Presented Exponential Fields. December 2009. [arXiv:0912.4019](#).
- [3] Jonathan Kirby. A note on the axioms for Zilber's pseudo-exponential fields. June 2010. [arXiv:1006.0894](#).
- [4] Vincenzo Mantova. Involutions on Zilber fields. September 2011. [arXiv:1109.6155](#).
- [5] David Marker. A remark on Zilber's pseudoexponentiation. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 71(3):791–798, 2006. [doi:10.2178/jsl/1154698577](#).
- [6] David W. Masser. Specializations of Finitely Generated Subgroups of Abelian Varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 311(1):413–424, 1989.
- [7] Boris Zilber. Pseudo-exponentiation on algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 132(1):67–95, 2005. [doi:10.1016/j.apal.2004.07.001](#).